

**REMARKS**

**Summary**

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 stand in this application. Claims 6 and 11 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 10 was previously withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, independent claim 1 has been amended to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found at least at FIG. 2B and accompanying description.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Cavallari for conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on December 3, 2008. During the interview, Examiner Cavallari and Applicants' representative discussed the independent claims, the applied references, and the grounds of rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected by the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Allowed Claim**

We would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claim 9.

**35 U.S.C. § 102**

At page 2 of the Office Action claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by United States Patent Number (USPN) 6,433,647 to Filoramo et al. (“Filoramo”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See MPEP § 2131*, for example. Applicant submits that Filoramo fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8 and 13 and thus they define over Filoramo. For example, with respect to amended independent claim 1, Filoramo fails to teach, among other things, the following language:

wherein the collectors of the first transistors of the first circuit portion are directly coupled, the collectors of the first transistors of the second circuit portion are directly coupled....

For instance, as illustrated in FIG. 2B of the present application, the collectors of transistors Q1 and Q2 of the first circuit portion are directly coupled and the collectors of transistors Q11 and Q12 of the second circuit portion are directly coupled. Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of independent claim 1 in the teachings of the Filoramo reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 1 defines over Filoramo. The Office Action relies on transistors Q3a and Q3b in figure 2 of Filoramo to teach the first transistors as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office Action identifies circuits A and B in figure 2 of Filoramo as corresponding to the first and second circuit

portions as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, the collector of transistor Q3a is not directly coupled to the collector of transistor Q4a of circuit A as required by claim 1. Furthermore, the collectors of transistors Q3b and Q4b of circuit B are also not directly coupled as required by claim 1. Consequently, Filoramo fails to disclose at least “wherein the collectors of the first transistors of the first circuit portion are directly coupled, the collectors of the first transistors of the second circuit portion are directly coupled....” Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Filoramo reference fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of amended independent claim 1 in the teaching of Filoramo. Consequently, Filoramo fails to disclose all the elements or features of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 13, which depend from claim 1 and, therefore, contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from Filoramo.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103

At page 5 of the Office Action claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filoramo in view of US 3,798,376 to Limberg (“Limberg”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection.

As recited above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 defines over Filoramo. Applicant submits that Limberg also fails to teach the above recited missing language of independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 12 depend from independent claim 1 and contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to dependent claims 2 and 12.

### Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

Appl. No. 10/621,147

Response Dated December 11, 2008

Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2008

Docket No.: 18065

Examiner: Cavallari, Daniel J.

TC/A.U. 2836

It is believed that claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-13 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Date: December 11, 2008

Autoliv ASP, Inc.  
Autoliv Patent Department  
3350 Airport Road  
Ogden, Utah 84405